

**TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES FOR  
MASTER PROJECT PLANS, SITE SPECIFIC WORK PLANS FOR  
SITES 6, 7, 12, 16 AND BACKGROUND,  
HABITAT EVALUATION, AND SITE 5 RISK EVALUATION  
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA  
FEBRUARY 10, 1994**

### **Introduction**

The meeting began at approximately 8:30 AM. Attachment A lists the attendees. Tom Black gave the introduction and welcome. Brenda Norton introduced the new Baker project team and explained that the staff from Roy F. Weston were no longer working on the project. Brenda also briefly explained the Federal Facilities Agreement and the Site Management Plan.

Commander Bob Scholes entered the meeting, made a brief welcome to everyone, and departed.

### **Habitat Evaluation**

Tom Biksey presented the Habitat Evaluation Report. Lisa Ellis asked why there were only eight sites covered in the Habitat Evaluation and if other sites would be evaluated in the future. Lynne Srinivasan noted that the eight sites were chosen because originally these eight sites were to be studied as the initial RI/FS group. However, after the Site Management Plan (SMP) was revised, the ranking and priority of sites changed and fewer sites were to be evaluated in the initial grouping of RI/FS sites. Funding had already been allocated for the Habitat Evaluation for the eight sites, so these were completed. As other sites are scheduled for RI/FS evaluation, they too will have a Habitat Evaluation completed.

Pat McMurray asked how the Habitat Evaluation can help to determine what to do at a site for further ecological work. Tom Biksey explained that the Habitat Evaluation helps to determine the potential exposure pathways for the conceptual site model. Pat also asked what happens after the Phase I ecological evaluation is completed. Tom Biksey noted that various factors such as media concentrations, species' population, general health of the species' found, and diversity are evaluated and compared to background values or literature values.

### **Master Project Plans**

Donna Weidemann discussed the Master Project Plans. Dexter Haven noted that there are natural springs or seepage of groundwater into the York River. He also said that the natural movement of water in the ground may not always be to the river. Donna Weidemann said that the movement of groundwater (direction and rate) will be studied as part of the RI/FS activities for the Station.

Pat McMurray asked if the low level detection limits for volatile compounds would be used at both sites and Site Screening Areas (SSAs). Lynne Srinivasan answered yes.

Rich Hoff discussed the Human Health Risk Assessment process. No questions were asked.

Tom Biksey explained the Ecological Risk Assessment process. No questions were asked.

Donna Weidemann continued the Master Work Plan discussion with a review of the Feasibility Study process. No questions were asked.

Donna Weidemann discussed the Master Field Sampling Plan. Nina Johnson asked how we will distinguish the sample numbering scheme between sites and SSAs. Donna Weidemann replied that sites will have a numerical designation for the first two digits, while SSAs will have that number preceded by an "A", followed by the SSA number. The remainder of the numbering scheme will be the same.

Donna Weidemann explained the Master Health and Safety Plan (HASP). Lynne Srinivasan explained that it was difficult to divide up the Master HASP and the Site-Specific HASP Addendum because the regulations require that all elements must be included in any HASP. However, to keep the goal of not being repetitive but still including all necessary elements of a HASP, both the Master and Site-Specific HASP Addendum have the same outline. Selected information (general) is located in the Master HASP, while information pertaining to sites or activities at those sites under study is located in the Site-Specific HASP Addendum.

Glen Cox asked a series of questions regarding documentation and emergency procedures. He wanted to know if decontamination areas will be set up for each site. Donna Weidemann answered yes. Glen asked how many people would be at each site at one time. Donna replied that Baker would have between 6 and 10 people plus a site manager. Additional people (subcontractors such as drilling, surveying) would also be on site.

Glen asked if there would be a site manager at each site. Lynne Srinivasan replied that there would be one site manager - a leader in charge for each group of sites studied. Glen asked if someone gets contaminated at a site, does Baker have procedures to decontaminate them. Lynne and Donna answered yes, however, it is unlikely that the levels of contamination to be encountered would warrant such activities or concerns.

A meeting break took place from 10:05 to 10:25.

Brenda Norton received word during the break that Rob Thomson from USEPA Region III would not be able to attend the meeting because of weather problems in both Philadelphia and Norfolk.

#### **Site Specific Project Plans**

Donna Weidemann began to discuss the Site-Specific Project Plans. Initially, the proposed background evaluation study was discussed. Lynne Srinivasan noted that during the April 1993 TRC meeting, data had been discussed which showed that using Carter Creek as a background location for sediment/surface water/biota was not acceptable because of elevated PCB concentrations detected in the sample collected. In addition, Roosevelt Pond, the on-Station location selected to represent background conditions during the Round One RI also had detectable levels of contamination. As such, it is unlikely that representative background conditions for the creeks and ponds would be found on the Station. Therefore, during the next phase of field investigation, a literature search will be completed to determine if published background values for sediment, surface water and biota are sufficient or if other off-Station background locations need to be identified.

A discussion of the two deep background wells with high groundwater pH values was begun. Donna Weidemann noted that the high pH values may be due to grout (cement and bentonite) adjacent to the well screen (improper well construction). The wells will be field tested to evaluate if the high pH is due to improper well construction or another unknown cause. Allen Brockman mentioned that it may be better to use a product such as Benseal rather than grout to avoid the pH problem. Donna Weidemann noted that it was up to the regulators as to what type of material is used to seal monitoring wells.

In reference to the statistical number of background samples, Brenda Norton mentioned that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the Biological Technical Assistance Group (BTAG) representatives, along with Sherri Eng (LANTDIV) and Rich Hoff (Baker), are looking at alternative ways to statistically arrive at a number of background samples. The actual number of background samples may change depending upon future discussions with NOAA and the BTAG.

Tom Biksey discussed the background ecological activities. No questions were asked.

Donna Weidemann continued with discussion of the activities planned for Sites 6 and 7. Allen Brockman asked if we would be analyzing grain size from the different soil associations. Donna replied that grain size would only be measured on the aquifer materials, not on the surface soils. Allen also asked what flow rate would be used for purging wells. Donna replied that the flow could vary from about 1/4 gallon per minute (gpm) to about 1 to 2 gpm.

Lisa Ellis asked if seepage meter tests were in line with current research. Allen Brockman replied yes. Donna Weidemann also noted that seepage meter tests can be used to get a relative idea of the rate of movement of groundwater/surface water across the groundwater/surface water interface.

Tom Biksey discussed the biota activities planned for Sites 6 and 7. Nina Johnson asked which NOAA sediment value was used in the Round One RI for comparisons. Lynne Srinivasan answered that it was the lower value (ER-L), which is more conservative.

Jim Burnett mentioned that based on flow direction in Felgates Creek, the York River will receive some discharge from Felgates Creek. Tom Biksey agreed, however, the biota studies planned for the Station will not include the York River because of the many other possible environmental influences on the York River other than the Station.

Glen Cox asked whether detection of nitramine compounds would result in excavation of those materials. Lynne Srinivasan responded that the necessity for excavation would be based upon the risk assessment results. Actions may or may not be taken - removing materials may be more harmful to the ecosystem than leaving contamination in place.

Tom Biksey discussed the ecological risk assessment.

Glen Cox questioned whether leaving contaminated material in place for a long time was a sound approach. Lynne Srinivasan noted that this would be determined in the Feasibility Study.

Allen Brockman asked who makes the field test kits for HMX/RDX. Donna Weidemann replied that the D-Tech Company makes these kits.

Lunch break from 11:30 to 12:30

Donna Weidemann discussed the site-specific plans for Site 12. Sherri Eng asked if surface soils meant 0 to 6 inches. Lynne Srinivasan answered yes, although the Naval Environmental Health Center's (NEHC) and Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) interpret surficial samples as coming from the 0 to 3 inch depth.

Sherri Eng asked when the Round One sampling was completed. Lynne Srinivasan noted that sampling occurred during the summer of 1992. Sherri noted that this year's upcoming field activities would be at the same time and that the data from the two sampling events would be more comparable than if sampling took place during two different seasons.

Glen Cox asked what would happen in an emergency situation if someone working on the site was contaminated. A lengthy discussion ensued in which both the potential chemical and physical dangers at the Station were discussed. It was noted that Riverside Hospital has been and will be notified prior to the initiation of field activities. Riverside is equipped to handle emergencies when chemical contamination is also suspected. The discussion also included mention of NEHC's comments.

Glen mentioned that he would like to visit the removal action sites to see how they are operating. Jennifer Loftin also offered to have Glen attend the pre-construction meeting for the removal actions. Jeff Harlow offered Glen the opportunity to visit the Sites/SSAs, anytime he was available, by contacting WPNSTA personnel to arrange visitation times.

#### **Site 5 Risk Evaluation**

Rich Hoff began his discussion of the Site 5 Risk Evaluation. Pat McMurray noted that the dermal exposure route was not addressed in this risk evaluation because Region III RBCs were used, and that the dermal exposure could be a significant part of the risk. Rich Hoff replied that the RBCs were used, but the dermal exposure would not be as significant because of the following: 1) the highest concentration of more than 20 samples were used, rather than the upper 95th percentile or the average; 2) the RBCs are very conservative in the amount of ingestion for exposure; and 3) the dermal exposure usually does not contribute significantly to the overall risk posed by PCBs. Pat asked if USEPA had agreed to this. Rich replied yes. Lynne Srinivasan noted that this issue was discussed with USEPA Region III last summer and it was agreed that because the RBCs were so conservative and the highest concentration would be used to assess risk, the dermal pathway would not need to be evaluated.

The meeting ended at approximately 2:30 p.m.

**ATTACHMENT A**  
**TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES FOR**  
**MASTER PROJECT PLANS, SITE SPECIFIC WORK PLANS FOR**  
**SITES 6, 7, 12, 16 AND BACKGROUND,**  
**HABITAT EVALUATION, AND SITE 5 RISK EVALUATION**  
**NAVAL WEAPONS STATION, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA**  
**FEBRUARY 10, 1994**

<u>Attendees</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Telephone</u>
Donna Weidemann	Baker Environmental, Inc.	(412) 269-2059
Lynne Srinivasan	Baker Environmental, Inc.	(412) 269-2010
Tom Biksey	Baker Environmental, Inc.	(412) 269-6048
Rich Hoff	Baker Environmental, Inc.	(412) 269-2099
Brenda Norton	LANTDIV	(804) 322-4778
Gregory Hatchett	LANTDIV	(804) 322-4589
Sherri Eng	LANTDIV	(804) 322-4787
Nina Johnson	LANTDIV	(804) 322-4775
Jim Burnett	National Park Service	(804) 898-3400
Jim Dishner	York Co. Public Safety	(804) 890-3600
Glen Cox	Newport News Fire - HAZMAT	(804) 886-7969
Pat McMurray	Virginia Dept. of Environmental Quality	(804) 762-4186
Lisa Ellis	Virginia Dept. of Environmental Quality	(804) 762-4205
Allen Brockman	U.S. Geological Survey	(804) 771-2427
John Dunn	Director York County Dept. of Environmental Serv.	(804) 890-3750
Sid Dixon	York Chapter, Chesapeake Bay Foundation	(804) 643-5158
Dexter Haven	York Chapter, Chesapeake Bay Foundation	(804) 898-3227
Tom Black	Public Affairs Officer Naval Weapons Station Yorktown	(804) 887-4444
Frank Strike	Environmental Assurance Naval Weapons Station Yorktown	(804) 887-4636
Valerie Walker	Environmental Assurance Naval Weapons Station Yorktown	(804) 887-4775
Jennifer Loftin	Environmental Assurance Naval Weapons Station Yorktown	(804) 887-4536

**ATTACHMENT A (Continued)**  
**TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES FOR**  
**MASTER PROJECT PLANS, SITE SPECIFIC WORK PLANS FOR**  
**SITES 6, 7, 12, 16 AND BACKGROUND,**  
**HABITAT EVALUATION, AND SITE 5 RISK EVALUATION**  
**NAVAL WEAPONS STATION, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA**  
**FEBRUARY 10, 1994**

Jeffrey Harlow

Environmental Assurance

Naval Weapons Station

Yorktown

(804) 887-4775

Charles Wilson

Natural Resources

Naval Weapons Station

Yorktown

(804) 887-4953